

2. Remarks.

Claims 1 through 4 and 7 through 20 are rejected over combinations of patents to Moyer, Jr. et al., Khachatoorian et al., or Crank et al. in view of Kanzawa, or Glesser design or utility, or Cavanagh. Independent claims 1, 10 and 16 are amended so that they are directed to the embodiment shown in Figs. 1, 2, 5 and 6, and specifically, to claim a hand tool handle with specific ridge patterns, wherein the ridges are longer at the forward and rearward ends, shorter toward the center of the handle.

None of the cited references discloses the structural features called out in the independent claims. Moyer, Jr. et al. discloses ridges that extend completely across the handle, wrap around both side edges, and which are all of the same length. The same is true of Crank et al, except the ridges do not wrap around the side edges. The ridges in Khachatoorian et al. extend across the upper and lower surfaces of the utility knife, and while Khachatoorian et al. does show ridges having differing length due to the increasing/decreasing size of the handle moving from front to back (when viewed from the side as in Fig. 1 of Khachatoorian et al.), the length of the ridges increases moving from either end of the handle toward the center. Similarly, the patents to Kanzawa disclose ridges that are of the same length or which extend to the sides of the handle and over the top side. And the "ridges" shown in Cavanagh define a spiral that encircle the handle. Glesser's ridges, in both the design and the utility case, likewise extend to the edges of the handle surfaces.

As amended, claim 1 specifies that the length of the ridges at the forward and rearward end of the handles are longer than the ridges adjacent the center of the handle. None of the references cited in the case disclose, teach or suggest such a structure. As noted in the specification, the claimed ridge pattern significantly increases the grip of the handle, especially when it is wet or muddy, etc.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claims 2 through 7 are allowable based on dependency.

In rejecting claim 8, the Examiner cites Cavanagh for disclosure of arcuate ridges. Applicant traverses this rejection. Cavanagh discloses a handle (bicycle)

having a coiled strip 2 wrapped in a spiral around the end of the handle. The coiled strip does not define arcuate ridges as claimed in claim 8, because a spiraling line is not arcuate but instead linear.

Claims 10 and 16 are amended to add structural features directed to the embodiment shown in Figs. 1, 2, 5 and 6. Specifically, claim 10 now calls for all of the ridges except those immediately adjacent the respective forward and rearward ends to terminate inwardly of the opposed side edges. As noted above, none of the cited references disclose this structure. Khachatoorian et al. disclose a handle that has an open space on the side of the handle with no slip resistant elements (42, 44), but the slip resistant elements extend across the entire top and bottom surfaces and extend partially up and down the side surfaces.

Finally, claim 16 is directed to very specific ridge patterns, wherein the length of the ridges decreases gradually from forward toward rearward, and from rearward toward forward. None of the references discloses or suggests this pattern.

All of the claims in the application are allowable over the art, and allowance is respectfully requested. The claims are not obvious over any combination of references because, among other reasons, there is no combination of references that may be made that would produce the invention claimed; and there is no suggestion that would motivate one having ordinary skill in the art to make the claimed handle.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas D. Hancock
Registration No. 35,889

September 21, 2005

ipsolon llp
805 S.W. Broadway, #2740
Portland, Oregon 97205
phone: (503) 249-7066

cc: Les de Asis